

New York Tribune.

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

SATURDAY, MAY 22, 1915.

Created and published daily by The Tribune Association, New York corporation, 410 N. York, President: G. Verner Rogers, Secretary and Treasurer: Adolph S. Ochs, Building, No. 125 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: By Mail, Postage Paid, outside Greater New York. Daily and Sunday, 1 month, \$1.00; 3 months, \$2.50; 6 months, \$4.50; 1 year, \$8.00. Daily only, 1 month, 50c; 3 months, \$1.25; 6 months, \$2.25; 1 year, \$4.00. Sunday only, 1 month, 25c; 3 months, 75c; 6 months, \$1.25; 1 year, \$2.00.

FOREIGN RATES: DAILY AND SUNDAY. One month, \$1.50; 3 months, \$3.50; 6 months, \$6.00; 1 year, \$10.00. SUNDAY ONLY. One month, 75c; 3 months, \$1.75; 6 months, \$3.00; 1 year, \$5.00.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

Dissensions in the Admiralty.

Of the causes that contributed to the overthrow and reconstruction of the British Cabinet the most potent, or at least the most urgent, was unquestionably the crisis at the Admiralty. With due allowance for the personal or party animus shown in many of the attacks on Mr. Winston Churchill and his policies, it has become more and more apparent that there have been serious differences between him and the Sea Lords.

Mr. Churchill's friends have made light of the disquieting rumors that have been heard for some months; they have argued that however omnipotent the First Lord may be in a legal sense, it is still in the power of the Sea Lords to coerce him, and by way of proving their point they refer to an incident that occurred when the naval programme for 1909 was laid before the Cabinet. A majority of the ministers objected to this stupendous enterprise, whereupon the entire Board of Admiralty threatened to resign in a body. The effect was immediate, and though it is true that on that occasion the First Lord was working in concert with the Sea Lords, it is argued that the incident makes it plain that the Sea Lords can always prevail either over their civilian chief or over the whole Cabinet.

The mischief is, however, that the First Lord is in fact the intermediary between the Board of Admiralty and the Cabinet and is directly responsible to Parliament for the efficiency of the fleet. The First Sea Lord is properly responsible to the First Lord, his position being, legally at least, purely advisory. Hence the incident cited to show the practical power of the Sea Lords is not altogether pertinent.

A distinguished sailor, the late Sir Geoffrey Hornby, once glanced at some of the difficulties that might arise between the politician and the naval adviser. He put the case thus: "It is for the politician to tell me if they want the Channel defended or not; that is their business. They tell me that I have to defend the Channel, and I then say, 'Very well; to do that I shall require so many ships, so many guns, or so many men.' That is my business. Then they have a right to say, 'That is too much. We cannot afford it, and we will give up the idea of defending the Channel.' That, again, is their business. But they have no right whatever to say, 'You do not require that number of guns, or ships, or men,' for that is not their business and they know nothing about it."

Now, it has been suspected for some time that Mr. Churchill, the politician, has been overruling the opinions of his advisers in naval affairs, as it is doubtless in his power to do. Some of his political opponents in Parliament have repeatedly hinted at his usurpation of powers properly belonging to others. Thus Lord Charles Beresford thought he detected the work of an inexperienced hand in the loss of the Formidable, and many others have accused him openly of the blundering that resulted in the loss of three battleships in the Dardanelles. It is true that he was apparently acquitted in the latter instance, but the question which led to his acquittal was ambiguous, and though it may have satisfied the House of Commons it did not silence his critics.

In a popular sense a more powerful argument in his favor was the character of Lord Fisher, the First Sea Lord, whose independence and doggedness would never allow him to give in on a point of vital importance. It must be remembered, however, that in matters of this kind the First Sea Lord is merely an adviser, and as Lord Fisher certainly understood that he was appointed in that capacity it is possible at least that he would submit to a considerable degree to the First Lord. That he would not submit beyond a certain point the events of the last few days seem to prove.

The difficulty in the First Lord's position is that it is partly naval, partly civil. In recent times the First Lords have always been civilians, the theory being presumably that naval officers are not capable of performing the civil duties and perhaps also that they are apt to show undue favor to men who have served under them. Yet it is a question whether in time of war a naval First Lord would not create more confidence in the nation. Many naval officers have, in fact, held this post with credit, notably Anson, Hawke, Howe and St. Vincent. One thing at least is certain, namely, that the First Lord should not be allowed to take upon himself the duties of the Sea Lords, though, with the Board of Admiralty constituted as it now is, it is possible for him on occasion to do so. This possibility will doubtless be provided against in future.

Mr. Churchill himself established a reform of supreme importance in the creation of the War Staff. This apparently indispensable department has been in existence only about three years and has abundantly proved its usefulness. But its

functions are wholly advisory and the executive part rests with the First Sea Lord. As long as the First Lord and the Sea Lord pull well together and do not interfere unduly with each other's work the present system is satisfactory enough, but as the First Lord is still responsible for "general direction of business" it is clear that an ambitious man with exaggerated confidence in his ability might very well prove to be a serious menace. Even his enemies are willing to admit that in this office Mr. Churchill has done splendid service, but that he is ambitious, impetuous, headstrong and not easily turned from opinions he has formed his best friends are not inclined to deny.

It is reported now that his immediate predecessor, Mr. McKenna, is to replace him. Mr. McKenna did well when he held the post before. Not a few of the reforms that Mr. Churchill carried out were begun under his administration and in the face of the most powerful opposition, as was shown in the Cabinet crisis, to which reference has already been made. He has many enemies and was often accused of weakness in the conduct of the Home Office, but no one can deny that he fought valiantly for national defence in spite of many discouragements, or that the great superiority of the British fleet over the German at the present time is largely due to his foresight and determination.

Mr. Barnes Loses.

Whatever the final decision of the jury in the Barnes-Roosevelt libel suit may be, it is evident that Mr. Barnes has failed to accomplish his purpose. He sought vindication and pecuniary damages because he was called a political boss who entered into a corrupt bipartisan alliance. Events in court yesterday, with the jury voting eleven to one against the plaintiff and willing to find for the defendant if the costs might be split between the litigants, presented a most unusual legal aspect. So far as the public is concerned, however, there is but one interpretation. In a political sense victory has perched on Colonel Roosevelt's banner.

"Mr. Barnes of Albany" often said, sneeringly, "We measure public sentiment here at the ballot box." So far as his political future is concerned, public sentiment has been measured in the trial at Syracuse. There entered into the evidence in this memorable case many things which Justice Andrews decided were not legal for the jury's consideration. But they could not be ruled out of the public mind. Expunged from the record of the libel suit, they will never be expunged from the political record in this state.

The evidence regarding Mr. Barnes' appeals for printing, his "salary" for acting as printing broker, his unpaid-for stock in the printing concern which handled state business, subsequently sold for a fat figure, will go down in political history along with the "honorarium" letter of the insurance investigation. On the outcome of this case Mr. Barnes staked his political future. He has lost. To Colonel Roosevelt an adverse verdict could not have been so disastrous, under any circumstances.

He retains that which he started with—the ability to continue fighting for the political principles in which he believes, and prestige and public confidence to back up that fight. Mr. Barnes, having appealed to the people and lost, has little chance, little hope, in any further appeal. Political views, political principles and practices which will not stand the test of investigation in court and a jury's deliberations can have no great drawing power for the general public.

This outcome is bound to be heartening to the members of all political parties who have been fighting the kind of machine politics which Mr. Barnes represented. It should be especially significant to all the younger Republicans—the progressive Republicans and their brothers who, once Republicans, became Progressives and are now Republicans again.

Mr. Barnes' case in court crumbled. Mr. Barnes politically crumbles. The political order which Mr. Barnes believes in so thoroughly, so aggressively, is crumbling before the views and activities of the young men of to-day. Bourbonism cannot prevail in the twentieth century.

Prosecute the Short Weighters!

Despite the repressive efforts of the State Department of Weights and Measures and the local Bureau of Weights and Measures, the testimony of experts is that short weighters rob the purchasing public of huge sums annually. Ex-Assemblyman Brooks, speaking to the Weights and Measures Association, figured the robbery at \$60,000,000. The trouble is not with the law. The trouble is not entirely with the means of detecting violations, although inspectors and adequate appropriations for the work are lacking. The trouble, according to Mr. Brooks, who fathered the "net weight" law, and Commissioner Hartigan, who tries to enforce it, is that it is even impossible to obtain convictions, or even prosecutions, under it.

The Attorney General is supposed to bring suit against violators. Mr. Hartigan said there had not been one prosecution on the many cases of violation submitted by him. On some evidence the Attorney General thought he couldn't prosecute successfully; other cases he suggested should be submitted to the District Attorney. That official in turn thought they should be taken to the Corporation Counsel. Only since Mr. Hartigan's declaration have certain suits been filed by the Attorney General's office.

Obviously the willful and persistent violators of this law will be "the big fellows"—those whose volume of business transforms the slight percentage of theft on one package into big annual profits—that is, plunder. Obviously they will have lots of money and clever lawyers to fight prosecution. That is no reason why the public should be left without protection. A law is just as good as its enforcement. If this one carries no teeth in the way of

penalties—not specified in its provisions, but collected by way of court proceedings—it is worth little to the public. There should be no shifting of responsibility from one official to another. One short weighter penalized assures the public of honest dealing thereafter more than all the fancy phrases of the statutes.

New York's Good Police.

President Wilson found "the appearance and management and whole spirit" of his police guard here "so admirable" that he has written a generous tribute to the force to be printed in the "Police Bulletin." He thinks the city has every reason to be proud of the efficiency of its blue-coated guardians. The city—save for a few croakers—thinks so, too.

Mr. Ellison, a while ago believed the Police Department was so honeycombed with dissatisfaction, so ill-treated and so rebellious against its chief, that he predicted a breakdown of Commissioner Woods' administration. Some of the police associations resented Mr. Ellison's remarks by rescinding his designation as counsel. The rank and file of the force chuckled or swore, and went on doing good police work along the lines desired by Mr. Woods. The breakdown has not occurred. The esprit de corps, the efficiency, which it has been the aim of the present administration in the department to build up, continue and undoubtedly are increasing.

New York's policemen to-day are clean, well set up, brave, intelligent, and the standard of honesty is beyond question higher than at any time in the past. It is not a perfect force, obviously—is perfection possible in this world?—but it is a body of public servants of which the public may well be proud, and it is gratifying to have the President pay tribute to its work.

Fighting Germany with Baseball.

America is preparing to enter the war in a very real sense. Hitherto it has confined itself largely to succoring non-combatants, to feeding the belligerents, to operating ambulance corps and hospitals and to supplying the Allies with ammunition. But now it purposes fostering baseball among the Canadians at the front. One might as well plant the Stars and Stripes in their trenches.

What a band is to soldiers on the march, what water is to the wounded—that must be baseball to the Canadian trench fighters, a refreshment of the most vital sort. When the consignment of baseballs, bats, gloves and cages, bearing the blessings of famous American League players, reaches the western front, therefore, our German friends may have cause to complain that we as a people have thrown neutrality to the winds. For it is one thing for the Canadians to use Yankee powder and shot and quite another for them to charge as if running to first, to swing the butts of their muskets as if bent on home runs, and in general to go to bat with their enemy like pinch hitters in a world series.

The Swiss may not have the naval equipment of this Republic, but if they get into a war with Germany because they take this country's attitude about the Lusitania affair they'll at least have some army to put behind their ultimatum.

It is really quite amazing how much more interesting is the statement that the young men in Yale drink, some of them to excess, than the equally true one that young men in general drink, a great many of them to excess.

The public will be willing to compromise by calling Mr. Barnes hereafter an ex-boss.

"Dee-lighted!"

A Hero in the Cause of Gossip.

(From The Manchester Guardian.) An officer who had been at a base for two months tells me that he was surprised one day when searching the letters of his detachment to read in one of them a passage that was something like this: "We have just got out of shell-fire for the first time for two months. It has been a hard time. The Germans were determined to take our field bakery, but by gee! we would not let them. We killed them in thousands." This was a letter from one of the bakers to his wife. None of the detachment had been a mile from the base, and they had never seen a German, except as a prisoner. My friend knew the writer well, and could not help (although it was none of his business) asking him why he told such terrible lies to his poor wife. The soldier said: "It's quite true what you say, but it's like this, sir. When my wife and the wives of the other men in the place where I live are talking it all over in the morning I couldn't think to let her have nothing to say and the others all bragging about what their men had done with the Germans. That's the way of it, sir."

Humane Work in Maine

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Will you kindly assist us, as you have done in former years, to make our annual appeal for contributions in support of the Humane Travelling Agent in Maine? This is a unique charity maintained wholly by summer residents, and is managed by a committee of which Mrs. Margaret Deland, Mrs. R. A. Boit, of Boston; Miss E. W. Storer, of Cambridge; the Hon. William B. Sanders, of Cleveland, and Mrs. R. Hall McCormick, of Chicago, are members.

In Maine, as in all other states, there are in remote villages, on isolated farms and in small lumbering camps cruelties to animals of which the casual visitor has no conception. Our agent found on one farm during the past winter a number of cattle and sheep without any shelter whatever, and some of the sheep were frozen to the snow and ice where they had lain down.

The record for the seven years during which this charity has existed is as follows: Number of persons visited and warned 2,858; Number of horses mercifully killed... 948; Number of cases prosecuted in court... 75 (In all but three of these the defendant was convicted.)

There are several active humane societies in Maine, notably at Portland, Auburn and Gardiner, but they have not the means or machinery to cover a state. The object of this committee is to supplement and in any way to interfere with their work. Contributions, however small, will be received with gratitude by either of the undersigned.

HENRY C. MERWIN, Secretary, 15 Beacon Street. HENRY PASTON CLARK, Treasurer, 110 Tremont Street. Boston, May 17, 1915.

"UNPREPAREDNESS"

Why Germany Maintains Present Attitude Toward This Country.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: As a reader of The Tribune it is my opinion that Germany's attitude toward this country in regard to the recent Lusitania massacre may be summed up in just one word, "unpreparedness."

Germany is seemingly willing to incur the enmity of the United States to strike what they consider a telling, but "useless blow" at Great Britain by the sinking of an unarmed merchant vessel, and then attempt to justify in an insulting and half-hearted way the act by laying the responsibility over to Great Britain, as if that would atone for the killing of this country's citizens.

To be absolutely plain, it is evident that Germany holds the United States as a fighting power in very cheap consideration. She has undoubtedly figured that as a hostile power arrayed against her we could make no material difference in the situation as it now stands. She has also figured that by the time we could put any number of men in the field the struggle would be settled one way or another, and also that the participation of this country in the war would mean the cutting off by one-half the ammunition and other war material which the Allies need, notably Great Britain.

Germany knows the only real fighting force of which this country can boast is our navy, and that is sadly deficient in all its departments. Does any person possessing the normal reasoning powers of an average man suppose American women and children would be subjected to the barbarous atrocities perpetrated upon them in the recent outrage, if our navy and land forces were even by half as efficient and strong as that of Great Britain or France?

Is this why the Triple Alliance ignominiously disregards our warnings and ultimatums sent from Washington as being unworthy of serious thought and consideration? If that be the case, let us remedy the fault, so that in the future we shall not be subjected to the humiliations we are forced into at the present time.

If Great Britain can place in the field one million men in the course of six or eight months' time—which she has done, and who seem to be holding their own with the flower of the German army—if necessary, and forced to it, the United States could do the very same, as it proved it could in the early months of '61.

The spirit which followed Pickett on that memorable day at Gettysburg and which braved the terrors of a Valley Forge still lives in the country, and only needs the faint fanning of the fire to again assert itself.

I may end by saying that President Wilson has the sincere backing of every loyal man and woman throughout the country, and that we may safely put our implicit trust and confidence in his ability and sound judgment, being sure that under his infallible guidance he will bring the America safely into the port of Trust, Safety and Honor in this hour of uncertainty.

HARVEY S. LONGSTREET, Glen Garden, N. J., May 12, 1915.

Work Horse Parade.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The Boston Work Horse Relief Association will hold on Memorial Day its thirteenth annual work horse parade. The entries number 1,336, which means an exhibition of at least two thousand horses—probably the biggest horse show in the world. The horses vary in size from a grocer's pony weighing 400 pounds to a truck horse weighing a ton, and among the entries are eight or ten four-horse teams, two six-horse teams, and one team of ten horses. The old horse class, the most interesting in the parade, has fifty entries, their ages ranging from fifteen to forty-one years.

At the first parade, in 1903, the huckster class had only a single entry, and at that time the hucksters' horses were notorious for their bad condition. Since then, owing chiefly to the influence of the annual parade, the hucksters' horses have improved immensely in condition and appearance, and the huckster class in this year's parade has seventy-five entries.

Every one of the 2,000 horses in the parade is separately judged for conformation, condition and soundness, but by an ingenious system of judging this is accomplished in about half an hour. BOSTON WORK HORSE RELIEF ASSOCIATION, Boston, Mass., May 19, 1915.

The Human Equation.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I am very sorry your paper is drifting toward war. That is why I take this time to speak to you as my heart speaks to our noble President:

"Woodrow Wilson, your heart's all right." I have tried to say to my poor little common heart, "be still, don't trouble the big noble heart," but it refuses. For war would mean to me an aged mother past eighty alone with no one to smooth the way, and a young wife to be watching and waiting. If I did I must make a debt all the rest of my days. So I trust our President, and I think I am safe, because he must be guided by the power higher than mere man.

FRANK FLEET, Cutchogue, L. I., May 19, 1915.

Foreign Flags.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Since the beginning of the war now going on foreign flags have almost totally disappeared from our streets. Let us keep them so. To start this, could not your paper take this matter up, or print the following, that it might be acted upon by some one?

On and after the first of July, 1915, flags of foreign nations, states and principalities shall not be carried through the streets of New York City nor displayed from any building, except carried by visiting soldiers or sailors from foreign countries or displayed to honor a regularly accredited representative from a foreign government.

JOHN ROBERTSON, New York, May 19, 1915.

Street Orators.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Have just read the letter of American since 1870, who complains about the speakers in Madison Square Park. I am an American since 1888, and I wish to voice my sentiments in regard to the meetings in this park.

I think they ought to be stopped, as they bring together all the riff-raff of the city. And besides they are a public nuisance and block up all the traffic in this vicinity.

GEORGE FULLER, New York, May 19, 1915.

Patriotism.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Your whole-hearted support of our Democratic President marks a far-sightedness and patriotism that should make right-thinking Republicans and Progressives mighty proud of The Tribune.

H. T. New York, May 18, 1915.

"NOW I KNOW I WAS RIGHT!"



GOVERNOR AND BOSS

Two Functions Should Be Combined for Responsibility and People's Protection.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Recent disclosures in the Barnes-Roosevelt libel case plainly show the real need in our system of party government for responsible leadership, but the need is just as urgent for the leader or boss to be subject to and under the influence and power of the voters. In regard to party politics in this state, the Governor of the state should be invested with the power of leadership, with the same powers that the present boss holds, for then the people would have some voice in approval or disapproval of his acts.

If a man is acceptable to the people of the commonwealth as its executive he should be good enough for them in directing the political affairs of the party that placed him in power. If the Governor of the state is the leader he can be held directly responsible for his acts, and the people will not be obliged to accept the time-worn excuse of "political expediency" when the interests of the people are disregarded.

The present system of party government in this state gives the boss a dangerous power over the people through his influence with the governing powers, without his being responsible to them for any acts of betrayal or corruption. It is an intolerable situation for a state executive to be subservient to a political boss. It is just as intolerable for a political boss to have control over the majority of the state Legislature, with the many opportunities of exercising a sinister influence over them to the detriment of the people's interest. There should be no power greater than that of the people, as voiced by the Governor of the state and the lawmaking body. The Republican or Democratic members of the Legislature should be subject to the responsible leadership of the Governor of the state.

JULES ORMONT, New York, May 18, 1915.

Woman Suffrage in California.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: In The Tribune of May 17 Mr. Schwelzer, of Los Angeles, passes judgment on women voters in California, declaring that there is an apathy and indifference that is surprising, and proceeds to repeat the other stock phrases used the world over by anti-suffragists in adverse criticism of woman suffrage.

I returned last week from a visit to California, and, as an ardent suffragist, I made a special effort to gain a fair impression of the working of woman suffrage there. I was more than gratified by what I heard on all sides. Women who acknowledged that they had been lukewarm suffragists before they won the vote told me that they were now enthusiastic voters. The change, they said, had come quietly and was working admirably. In no instance did I hear the slightest suggestion of a "reaction" and still less any intimation of Mr. Schwelzer's accusations.

HELEN SCRIBNER, New York, May 18, 1915.

Why Do "Antis" Exist?

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I observe that some of the rich women of Trenton, Paterson, Princeton, Morristown, Montclair, Orange and other New Jersey cities held an "enthusiastic" meeting in Masonic Hall, Trenton, recently, under the auspices of the Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.

What we working women can't understand is why such a middle-class society exists. What excuse can it give for itself? These grand dames don't have to vote. Why "butt in" and become enthusiastic about preventing their hard working sisters from voting? These "favorites of fortune" know nothing of real life and its needs. We workers are in close touch with the economic problems of life—an unknown world to these representatives of the "smart set." We must have the ballot to regulate our wages, our hours of labor and to safeguard our children workers. We see the splendid results where our sisters are voting in the twelve Western states and want these benefits in New Jersey, too.

Why do these thoughtless "antis" interfere with us? Would we presume to interfere with them?

WATERBURY, Conn., May 18, 1915.

"UNBELIEVABLE FEROCITY"

An American's Impressions of German Cavalry in the Lille District.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Mr. H. W. Strauss must remember that certain American correspondents moved with or behind the main German columns which marched through to attack the Allies after Belgium had been terrorized and subdued. Thus they naturally saw little of the atrocities officially sanctioned by the policy of terrorism which has a regular place in the German plan of campaign. Offences against women may be laid at the door of the brutes and degenerates that can be found in any army, and crop out when isolated patrols or detachments are operating outside the stern eye of discipline. But the shameful war on innocent civilians, under official sanction, is a black page in German history, which any American who was in the war zone when swept by the advance guard of invasion will vouch for.

We have yet to read of the unbelievable ferocity of the German cavalry that swept over the Lille district when Antwerp was retreating and the Uhlans started to pave the way for the projected invasion of Paris. I saw enough on the fringe of the district to realize that the German policy is that of a mad dog, which tears every one that stands in the way, irrespective of age or sex.

Oh, for a camera, so rigorously forbidden, that I could reproduce for others the sight of the bodies of kindly French gentlemen of the old school, grandfathers nearly sixty, the last line of territorial reserves, who were holding bridges and patrolling railway roads beyond Hazebrouck. Gallantly they made their isolated stands until their scanty cartridges were gone—then they were ridden down, the survivors, many wounded, overtaken and beaten to death. "Mere civilians" was the excuse because some were not fully equipped. Quarter was never heard of. They were weak, isolated but aggressive, and so they were exterminated. Old farmers and the few men unfit for military service were ruthlessly shot down when escaping and farms burnt with no provocation, the women and children exposed to the bitter spell of early winter which struck France in October.

War? Nonsense. There were fair-sized towns that could have been captured with ease, exposed railroad bridges that could have been destroyed, but entire divisions of cavalry were spreading over the districts, burning, looting and slaying because terrorism was their only object. Invasion in force was to follow, only the British came up in time from the Aisne. How can Americans see the entire provinces of our sister republic ground under this ruthless heel and withhold sympathy?

New York, May 19, 1915. RED CROSS.

Americans Too Good.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I should like to inform Edward Fuchs as to the meaning of Americanism as it is conceived by one who is not an American, but who has lived in this country for eight years. Let us take Dr. Dernburg's case. In Italy he would have been mobbed at his first utterance. Switzerland would have had him quietly across the border in twenty-four hours. And there is no telling what would have happened to him had he been an American in Germany, preaching for America what he has preached for Germany in the United States.

Here nothing was done to him. A few good Americans suggested a few mild remedies, such as muzzling the man whose speeches had become an insult to the intelligence of the United States. But as yet no action had been taken to have him safely out of the country. The trouble with the good American is that he is too good and too slow in dealing with Americans that still are and always will be Germans.

A. C. Worcester, Mass., May 18, 1915.

Voicing Indignation.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Your cartoon of May 12, "The Man Who Was Not Too Proud to Fight," aroused intense indignation in many of your readers. What is the result of King Albert's course? Should we be reduced to a similar plight?

Who would feed and clothe us, as we have the Belgian survivors? It is, indeed, fortunate that we have a President who is above acting on schoolboy "dares," and it is most unseemly that a paper of your standing could hold him up to ridicule while he tries to protect us from the horrors of war.

"ONE WHOSE ANCESTORS FOUGHT FOR OUR NATION IN THE REVOLUTION AND IN THE CIVIL WAR." Waterbury, Conn., May 18, 1915.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: The editorial published in The New York Tribune of Tuesday, May 11, 1915, entitled "Education for the Park Vandals," and the sentiments therein expressed against vandalism and hoodlumism in our public parks are deserving of praise and commendation. Your paper has taken a step in the right direction, and will receive the support of all the good citizens to keep healthy and clean our public parks, and the police and city magistrates should assist in every manner possible to punish the offenders who throw rubbish and other litter over the grass.

May I call your attention to another ordinance which is commonly violated in the vicinity of Stuyvesant Park, situated between Fifteenth and Seventeenth Streets and between Rutherford Place and Livingston Place, in this city—namely, by permitting their dogs to run loose and at times take them into the park attached to a leash. Numerous complaints have been received from a great many mothers of children that these dogs destroy and soil the plants and grass by being permitted to roam through the park, and thereby become a great menace to the health of the many children who patronize this park daily for health, recreation and pleasure.

The campaign which you have set on foot is certainly approved by a great many of the residents who live in close proximity to Stuyvesant Park. HENRY SCHNEIDER, New York, May 18, 1915.